UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,832	10/30/2000	Barry J. Glick	774070-5	8186

23879 7590 04/20/2005

BRIAN M BERLINER, ESQ
O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP
400 SOUTH HOPE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2899

EXAMINER	
KIM, JUNG W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/699,832	GLICK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jung W. Kim	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 November 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-54 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. The following is a response to applicant's arguments on pages 11-18 in the amendment filed on November 17, 2004 (hereinafter Remarks).

3. In view of the definition of the term "associate digital information with the location identity attribute" disclosed in the Remarks, pg. 11, 3rd full paragraph, 5th sentence and the definition of "associating location identity" in applicant's Specification, pg. 7, lines 25-26, applicant's arguments with regard to the Murphy art prior art have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejections of the claims rejected under Murphy have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Shimada 5,922,073, Laurance 4,860,352, Fennel 4,418,425, and Schipper 5,577,122.

4. Regarding applicants argument Schipper fails to suggest or disclose the step of "associating with the digital information a location identity attribute that defines at least a specific geographic location" as defined in claim 1, or "software instructions operable to cause the processor to associate with the digital information a location identity attribute that defines at least a specific geographic location" as defined in claim 28, or

"encrypting said digital information using an encryption key based at least in part on said location identity attribute" as defined in claim 17, or "software instructions operable to cause said processor to encrypt said digital information using an encryption key based at least in part on said location identity attribute" as defined in claim 44 because pseudorange correction values (PRC) are used as parameter values to determine the encryption key for messages transmitted to other mobile stations and do not uniquely identify a geographic location, "but instead represent the difference between the known location of the fixed station and the calculated location" (Remarks, pg. 15, last paragraph-page 16, 1st full paragraph), examiner respectfully disagrees. Schipper explicitly discloses the PRC values in conjunction with the PR values accurately identify the location of an SATPS antenna for a station. Col. 6:30-67. In this manner, the PRC is a part of the location identity attribute which is "associated" with digital information, wherein the location identity attribute defines a specific geographic location. Hence, Schipper fully meets the limitations recited in claims 1 and 28. Moreover, since the PRCs seed the encryption key, the limitations of 17 and 44 are also covered.

5. Regarding applicant's argument Shimada does not "associate" the information with location as the term is used in the present application (Remarks, pg. 17, 3rd full paragraph), examiner respectfully disagrees. The definition recited in applicant's Specification of the term "associating location identity" is "a method of marking digital information with a location identity attribute" (pg. 7). Hence, under the broadest reasonable interpretation of the term "associate", Shimada clearly associates location

identity with digital information by adding the location attribute to a data. Shimada, fig. 2 and related text.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claim 18 recites the limitation "said generating step" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

9. Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-35, 37-39 and 41-54 of this application conflict with claims 1-42 of copending Application No. 09,904,962 and claims 1-50 of copending Application No. 09,992,378. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-17, 19-30, 32, 34, 35, 37-39 and 41-54 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42 of copending Application No. 09758637. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed invention recited in claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-17, 19-30, 32, 34, 35, 37-39 and 41-54 of the instant application define a more general method and apparatus as the claimed invention defined in copending application no. 09758637.

12. Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-25, 28-35, 37-39 and 41-52 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-50 of copending Application No. 09992378. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed invention recited in claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-25, 28-35, 37-39 and 41-

52 of the instant application define a more general method and apparatus as the claimed invention defined in copending application no. 09992378.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

14. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 15, 16, 21-30, 32, 34, 35, 37-39, 42, 43 and 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada U.S. Patent No. 5,922,073 (hereinafter Shimada).

15. As per claims 1 and 28, Shimada discloses a method and apparatus for controlling access to digital information, comprising associating with the digital information a location identity attribute that defines at least a specific geographic location, wherein the digital information can be accessed only at the specific geographic location; wherein a processor having memory adapted to store software instructions is operable to cause the processor to associate with the digital information the location attribute. Shimada, col. 3:35-49; 4:36-44.

16. As per claims 2 and 29, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the location identity attribute further comprises at least a location value and a proximity value. Shimada, figures 14 and 15, 'Within 1km around SHINJUKU Station'.

17. As per claims 3 and 30, the rejections of claims 2 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the location value corresponds to a location of an intended recipient appliance of the digital information. Shimada, fig. 2, Reference No. 5 and related text.

18. As per claims 5 and 32, the rejections to claims 2 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the location value further comprises a latitude value and a longitude value. Shimada, figure 15.

19. As per claims 7 and 34, the rejections to claims 3 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. In addition, the proximity value corresponds to a zone that encompasses the location. Shimada, figures 14, 15, 17 and 18.

20. As per claims 8 and 35, the rejections of claims 7 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the zone further comprises at least one of a rectangular region, a polygonal region, a circular region, and an elliptical region. Shimada, figures 14 and 15.

21. As per claims 10 and 37, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the apparatus further comprises means for enforcing the location identity attribute by allowing access to the digital information only at the specific geographic location. Shimada, figure 13, reference nos. S5, S6 and S8.

22. As per claims 11 and 38, the rejections of claims 10 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the enforcing means further comprises means for identifying location of an appliance through which access to the digital information is sought. Shimada, figure 13, reference no. S5.

23. As per claims 12 and 39, the rejections to claims 11 and 38 rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the enforcing means further comprises means for comparing the appliance location to the specific geographic location defined by the location identity attribute, wherein access to the digital information is allowed only if the appliance location falls within the specific geographic location. Shimada, figure 13, reference nos. S6 and S8.

24. As per claim 15 and 42, the rejections of claims 11 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the location identifying means

further comprises means for recovering the appliance location from a GPS receiver embedded in the appliance. Shimada, col. 3:55-59.

25. As per claims 16 and 43, the rejections of claim 11 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the location identifying means further comprises means for recovering the appliance location by triangulating RF signals received by the appliance. Shimada, col. 1:36-41.

26. As per claims 21 and 48, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the location identity attribute is integrated with the digital information. Shimada, figure 2, reference no. 10 and related text.

27. As per claims 22 and 49, the rejections of claims 21 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the location identity attribute is included in a portion of a file containing the digital information. Shimada, figure 2, reference no. 10 and related text, especially col. 3:38-40.

28. As per claims 23 and 50, the rejections of claims 22 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the method and apparatus further comprise steps and means for enforcing the location identity attribute by allowing

access to the file by a corresponding software application only at the specific geographic location. Shimada, figures 2, 9, 10 and 13, and related text.

29. As per claims 24 and 51, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the method and apparatus further comprise steps and means for enforcing the location identity attribute by allowing retrieval of the digital information from memory only at the specific geographic location. Shimada, figure 13, reference nos. S5, S6 and S8.

30. As per claims 25 and 52, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the apparatus further includes means for enforcing the location identity attribute by allowing visual display of the digital information only at the specific geographic location. Shimada, figure 9 and related text.

31. As per claims 26 and 53, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the digital information and the location identity attribute in a fixed format including at least one of CD-ROM, DVD, diskette, videocassette, and tape. Shimada, col. 9:41-47.

32. As per claims 27 and 54, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the digital information and the

location identity attribute are transmitted in electronic form via one of telephone line, video cable, satellite broadcast, fiber optic, and wireless. Shimada, col. 5:35-36.

33. Claims 1, 10-12, 17, 19, 20, 28, 37-39, 44, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Laurance et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,860,352 (hereinafter Laurance).

34. As per claims 1 and 28, Laurance discloses a method and apparatus for controlling access to digital information, comprising associating with the digital information a location identity attribute that defines at least a specific geographic location, wherein the digital information can be accessed only at the specific geographic location; wherein a processor having memory adapted to store software instructions is operable to cause the processor to associate with the digital information the location attribute. Laurance, col. 22:47-24:28 and 31:12-34:45; especially 23:1-10.

35. As per claims 10-12, 17, 19, 20, 37-39, 44, 46 and 47 the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under Laurance 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. In addition, the digital information is encrypted using an encryption key based on at least in part on the location identity attribute and the location identity attribute is enforced by allowing decryption of the digital information only at the specific geographic location; wherein the generation of a decryption key is based on at least in part on the specific geographic

location, the decryption key being thereby used to decrypt the digital information. Laurance, col. 22:47-24:28 and 31:12-34:45; especially 23:1-10.

36. Claims 1, 10-12, 17, 19, 20, 28, 37-39, 44, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schipper et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,577,122 (hereinafter Schipper).

37. As per claims 1 and 28, Schipper discloses a method and apparatus for controlling access to digital information, comprising associating with the digital information a location identity attribute that defines at least a specific geographic location, wherein the digital information can be accessed only at the specific geographic location; wherein a processor having memory adapted to store software instructions is operable to cause the processor to associate with the digital information the location attribute. Schipper, col. 6:41-7:57.

38. As per claims 10-12, 17, 19, 20, 37-39, 44, 46 and 47, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under Schipper 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. In addition, the digital information is encrypted using an encryption key based on at least in part on the location identity attribute and the location identity attribute is enforced by allowing decryption of the digital information only at the specific geographic location; wherein the generation of a decryption key is based on at least in part on the specific geographic

location, the decryption key being thereby used to decrypt the digital information. Schipper, col. 7:57-8:10.

39. Claims 1, 10-12, 17, 19, 20, 28, 37-39, 44, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fennel, Jr. et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,418,425 (hereinafter Fennel).

40. As per claims 1 and 28, Fennel discloses a method and apparatus for controlling access to digital information, comprising associating with the digital information a location identity attribute that defines at least a specific geographic location, wherein the digital information can be accessed only at the specific geographic location; wherein a processor having memory adapted to store software instructions is operable to cause the processor to associate with the digital information the location attribute. Fennel, figures 4 and 5; col. 1:26-29; 3:12-4:16.

41. As per claims 10-12, 17, 19, 20, 37-39, 44, 46 and 47, the rejections of claims 1 and 28 under Fennel 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. In addition, the digital information is encrypted using an encryption key based on at least in part on the location identity attribute and the location identity attribute is enforced by allowing decryption of the digital information only at the specific geographic location; wherein the generation of a decryption key is based on at least in part on the specific geographic

location, the decryption key being thereby used to decrypt the digital information. Fennel, figures 4 and 5; col. 3:12-4:16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

42. Claims 4, 6, 9, 31, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Hastings et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,370,629 (hereinafter Hastings).

43. As per claims 4 and 31, the rejections of claims 2 and 29 under Shimada 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) Shimada does not expressly disclose the location identity attribute value further comprising a temporal value. Hastings teaches a location identity attribute value including a temporal value to restrict user access to data based on the time of request. Hastings, figure 4, Reference Nos. 440 and 460 and related text. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the location identity attribute to further comprise a temporal value since it further secures access by having a usage policy based on a time interval; the addition of a time attribute pin points a person in 4-dimensions: place and time. Hastings, col. 2:47-49. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 4 and 31.

44. As per claims 6 and 33, the rejections of claims 5 and 32 under Shimada 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) Shimada does not expressly disclose

the location identity attribute to include an altitude dimension. Hastings discloses pin pointing a user requesting information based on an altitude dimension. Hastings, 4:10-14. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the location identity attribute to include an altitude dimension since it enables a more concise restricted region defining the location of a company located only on specific floors of a building. Shimada, fig. 15 and Hastings, 4:12-13. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 6 and 33.

45. As per claims 9 and 36, the rejections of claims 7 and 34 under Shimada 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) Shimada discloses the zone to comprise a known geographic regions including a building, a company, and a regions around a landmark (figs 14 and 15), but does not expressly teach the zone to comprise a known geographic region including one of a postal zip code, a state, a city, a county, a telephone area code, and a country. Hastings discloses restricting access to information depending, inter alia, if the user is located within a location zone; the location zone comprising a known geographic region including one of a postal zip code, a state, a city, a county, a telephone area code, and a country for the purpose of restricting access. Hastings, col. 2:40-46. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the zone to be selected from a known geographic region including one of a postal zip code, a state, a city, a county, a telephone area code, and a country since defining zones based on these attributes maps user's access to information based on societal and cultural needs to enable a

more pertinent service. Hastings, ibid. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 9 and 36.

46. Claims 13 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Emery et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,727,057 (hereinafter Emery).

47. As per claims 13 and 40, the rejections of claims 11 and 38 under Shimada 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) Shimada is silent on the matter of resolving the appliance location from a street address for the appliance. Emery teaches an apparatus for storing and communicating geographical positioning data using GPS wherein conversion software is used to resolve the location of a device from a street address. Emery, col. 5:37-42. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to resolve the location of an appliance based on a street address for the appliance since it enables location to be based on a postal address, which is a format that is more accessible to a non-technical user. Emery, ibid. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 13 and 40.

48. Claims 14 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada.

49. As per claims 14 and 41, the rejections of claims 11 and 38 under Shimada 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) Further, Shimada discloses retrieving

the appliance location from within the appliance (fig. 2), but does not expressly disclose retrieving the appliance location from a file stored within the appliance. However, it is notoriously well known in the art for information to be stored in temporary directories such as files. For example, files are the basic means of storing and organizing data on Windows and Linux stations. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the appliance location to be stored in a file within the appliance since data stored in a conventional filesystem are easily accessible by applications (determining unit) within the appliance. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 14 and 41.

50. Claims 18 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurance in view of Shimada.

51. As per claims 18 and 45, the rejections of claims 17 and 44 under Laurance 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are incorporated herein. (supra) Laurance discloses deterministically combining position and non-position variables to yield the encryption key (Laurance, col. 22:50-23:43 and 31:15-32:28), but does not disclose deterministically combining an area parameter defining a region that encompasses the specific geographic location with the location identity attribute to yield the encryption key. Shimada discloses defining a location identity attribute to include an area parameter by which to restrict user access to only those users within the area parameter. Shimada, figures 14 and 15 and related text. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to deterministically combine an area parameter with the location identity attribute to yield the encryption key since an area parameter creates an encryption key specific to the context of the access constraint of the user and hence enables a more secure method and apparatus. Shimada and Laurance, ibid. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 18 and 45.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jung W. Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-3804. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jung W Kim
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

GILBERTO BARRÓN JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jk
April 13, 2005